



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

✓

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/652,611	08/30/2000	Charles E. Cantwell	10003898-1	4360
7590	01/13/2005		EXAMINER	
Hewlett Packard Company Intellectual Property Administration P O Box 272400 Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400			KANG, PAUL H	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2141	

DATE MAILED: 01/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/652,611	CANTWELL, CHARLES E. <i>CH</i>	
Examiner	Art Unit		
Paul H Kang	2141		

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 October 2004.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-3,5-10 and 12-18 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-3, 5-10, and 12-18 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: ____ .

DETAILED FINAL ACTION

1. Examiner Sajid Yussuf is no longer assigned to the present patent application. This application is now assigned to Examiner Paul H. Kang. In examining this patent application, full faith and credit has been given to the search and action of the previous examiner. MPEP § 719.05.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 5-10, and 12-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Franklin et al. US Pat. App. No. 2001/0023440 A1, in view of Hancock et al., US Pat. No. 6,295,502 B1.

2. As per claims 1, 8 and 15, Franklin discloses a method for learning the physical location of a resource in communication with a network, where the method comprises assigning to the resource a global resource locator (GRL) tag, the GRL tag including at least a description of the physical location of the resource, the description of the physical location including a coordinate system and coordinates for the resource, communication the GRL tag over the network, and extracting the description of the physical location from the GRL tag (Fig. 1; Fig. 7; Page 1, paragraph [0015]; Page 3, paragraph [0044]; Page 4, paragraph [0054]: Franklin teaches

assigning a resource application object for each resource over a network, where each object has the geographic position of the resource).

However, Franklin does not explicitly teach a system and method wherein the description of the physical location includes a coordinate system. In the same field of endeavor, Hancock teaches a system and method of identifying geographical locations wherein descriptions of various coordinate systems are used (Hancock, col. 26, lines 18-36 and col. 29, line 54 – col. 30, line 37).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the description of the coordinate system, as taught by Hancock, into the GRL system of Franklin for the purpose of accommodating multiple coordinate systems.

3. As per claim 2, Franklin-Hancock further teaches storing the GRL tag on the resource (Franklin, Page 2, paragraph [0020]).

4. As per claim 3, Franklin-Hancock further teaches storing the GRL tag in a list of resources in a server (Franklin, Fig. 3; Page 4, paragraph [0050]: Franklin stores an object tree 92 of application objects 100 in a directory service server 81).

5. As per claim 5, Franklin-Hancock also teaches the GRL tag including a descriptive label of the resource in the GRL tag (Franklin, Fig. 7; Page 4, paragraph [0054]).

6. As per claims 6 and 16, Franklin-Hancock further teaches including applying user selected search criteria to the GRL tag (Franklin, Fig. 3, Item 106; Page 1, paragraph [0015], Page 4, paragraph [0050]).

7. As per claims 7 and 17, Franklin-Hancock also teaches the user a selected search criterion includes that comparison of a location of the user to the location of the resource (Franklin, Fig. 3; Page 1, paragraph [0015], Page 4, paragraph [0050]).

8. As per claim 8, Franklin-Hancock teaches a system for learning the physical location of a resource in communication with a network where the system comprises a network resource, a client device, a network for providing communication between the network resource and the client device, a tag assignor configured to assign to the resource a global resource locator GRL tag including at least a description of the physical location of the resource, the description of the physical location including a coordinate system and coordinates for the resource, and executable code, accessible by the client, configured to extract the description of the physical location from the GRL tag for the client (Franklin, Page 1, paragraph [0015]; Page 2, paragraph [0017]; Page 3, paragraph [0044]; Page 4, paragraph [0054]).

9. As per claim 9, Franklin-Hancock further teaches the means for the tag assignor to store the GRL tag on the resource (Franklin, Page 2, paragraph [0020]).

10. As per claim 10, Franklin-Hancock further teaches the assignor to include a server, a list of resources stored on the server and means for storing the GRL tag in the list of resources (Franklin, Fig. 3; Page 2, paragraph [0017]; Page 4, paragraph [0050]; Franklin stores an object tree 92 of application objects 100 in a directory service server 81).

11. As per claim 12, Franklin-Hancock also teaches the tag assignor includes means for providing a descriptive label of the resource in the GRL tag (Franklin, Fig. 7; Page 2; paragraph [0017]; Page 4, paragraph [0054]).

12. As per claim 13, Franklin further teaches executable code is further configured to apply user selected search criteria to the GRL tag (Franklin, Fig. 3, Item 106; Page 1, paragraph [0015], Page 4, paragraph [0050]).

13. As per claim 14, Franklin-Hancock also teaches the user a selected search criterion includes that comparison of a location of the user to the location of the resource (Franklin, Fig. 3; Page 1, paragraph [0015], Page 4, paragraph [0050]).

14. As per claim 18, Franklin-Hancock further teaches displaying to the user resource meeting the user selected search criteria (Franklin, Page 2, paragraphs [0020]-[0027]).

Response to Arguments


Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3, 5-10 and 12-18 filed October 18, 2004 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The applicant argued in substance that the prior art of record failed to teach a GRL tag comprising a description of the physical location including a coordinate system. The new grounds of rejection teaches this feature.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul H Kang whose telephone number is (571) 272-3882. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 hour flex. First Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on (571) 272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



PAUL H. KANG
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER